

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/25/100217

Site Address: 13 WESTWOOD GARDENS, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1FN

Case Officer: Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Description: Single-storey rear extension, first-floor side/rear extension, infill of existing side canopy with pitched roof, and replacement of existing front porch.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Within the Urban Edge • Within Established Residential Area • Within Built-up Area Boundary		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/27906/000/00 - Ground floor side and rear extensions - Permit - 26/10/1984		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	No comments received.		
Parish Council:	No comments received.		
Tree Consultant:	By conditioning compliance to the drawings (530_03) – if you are minded to approve the application – we would also be conditioning compliance to the setting out of the Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ), as shown in the Site Plan.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 3 rd November 2025.		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance
Development Plan: The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u> The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1 and S2; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM11 and DM14.
Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment:
<u>Site context and surroundings</u>
The application site comprises a two-storey, four-bedroom detached dwelling positioned at the end of a cul-de-sac within Westwood Gardens. The property occupies a good-sized plot and is of a brick-built construction typical of the surrounding area. The front elevation includes a porch accessed via external steps. To the eastern side of the dwelling is a

covered passageway leading to the utility room, situated between the host dwelling and the attached single garage. The garage adjoins the neighbouring garage at 14 Westwood Gardens. The surrounding area is residential in character and consists predominantly of detached two-storey dwellings.

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for several extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling. The works include a single-storey rear extension to provide additional ground-floor living accommodation, together with the infilling of the existing rear void to create a continuous link with the existing snug. A first-floor extension is proposed above the snug on the western side of the property to provide an en-suite and dressing room. The proposal also includes the infilling of the existing covered side passage to form a study, alongside the replacement of the current flat roof in this area with a pitched roof. In addition, the existing flat-roofed front porch is to be removed and replaced with a new gable-fronted porch.

The proposed materials comprise brickwork to match the existing dwelling, supplemented with areas of dark grey textured fibre-cement cladding. The new roof elements are to be finished in matching concrete tiles. All new windows are proposed to be light grey uPVC, and the external doors are to be constructed in light grey composite or aluminium.

Policy and Principle

The application site lies within an established residential area where the basic principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being based upon the exact nature, design, and impact of that proposed being considered acceptable and in accordance with the relevant policies within the adopted local plan and supplementary planning guidance.

Layout, design, and impact upon the character of the area

- Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that all new development should respect the character and appearance of urban areas, take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible in terms of mass, scale, layout density, design, and siting.
- The proposed extensions would increase the overall bulk and massing of the host dwelling. However, the additions are proportionate to the size of the plot and the scale of the existing building.
- The single-storey rear extension is modest in both height and depth, and owing to its rear position, it would not be visible from the public realm, resulting in no adverse visual impact.
- The proposed first-floor side/rear extension would be set well back from the principal elevation and positioned below the height of the main roof and would therefore read as a subservient addition to the host dwelling. Although this element includes dark grey fibre-cement cladding, which introduces a new material to the property, its position is largely screened from public view. As such, the use of this material would not materially affect the character or appearance of the street scene.
- The infilling of the covered side passage, together with the replacement of the existing flat roof with a pitched roof, would provide a more unified built form and achieve better integration with the main dwelling.
- Similarly, the replacement of the existing front porch with a gable-fronted design would provide a more defined entrance feature, enhancing the overall appearance

of the frontage.

Impact on residential amenity

- Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) amongst other matters, stipulate that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents.
- The single-storey rear extension is modest in height and depth and remains a sufficient distance from the shared boundaries. Given its scale and positioning, it would not result in material overshadowing, loss of light, or an overbearing impact on the adjoining properties.
- There is no immediate neighbouring dwelling to the west of the application site; this side of the property adjoins the rear garden boundaries of properties fronting Merdon Avenue. Given the generous separation distance of approximately 39m between the proposed first-floor extension and the nearest rear elevation on Merdon Avenue, the development would not result in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of light, or appear overbearing when viewed from neighbouring properties. In addition, no side-facing windows are proposed within the first-floor extension, and therefore the development would not give rise to any direct overlooking or loss of privacy.
- The infilling of the covered side passage and the replacement porch are modest in scale and, due to their siting, would not give rise to any adverse impact in terms of outlook, light, or privacy for adjoining occupiers.

Trees and landscaping

- The Council's Tree Consultant has reviewed the proposal and confirmed that there are no significant trees that would be directly impacted by the extensions. The submitted Site Plan includes a clearly defined Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) around the root protection areas of the boundary trees. The Tree Consultant has advised that the CEZ, if secured through condition, provides satisfactory protection, provided no construction activity takes place within this area.

Highways and parking

- Policy DM14 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires residential development to provide off-highway parking which is adequate in terms of highway safety/traffic management.
- The proposal does not involve any alteration to the existing garage or the hardstanding to the front of the property. The dwelling would remain a four-bedroom property, and the existing on-site parking layout would be retained. As such, the development would not affect the level of parking provision available at the site.

Climate Change:

In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve carbon neutrality by 2025; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030; (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020–2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF, development plan and adopted local plan policy do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and local plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the adopted local plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts.

The NPPF, Policies S1, DM2 and DM3 of the Local Plan and energy and water elements of the adopted Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD require development to be sustainable in terms of resource use, climate change and energy use. When considering the impact of climate change, the proposed development is expected to be resilient to the potential effects of climate change.

Equalities Implications:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:

- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications

Conclusion:

Permit subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐